REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are all the claims pending in the application. By this amendment, claims 1, 4, 5 and 8 are amended. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections, and allowance of the claims.

Claims 1-8, 17 and 18 stand rejected based on the Examiner's proposed combination of Adiwoso and Schiff, claims 9 and 10 stand rejected based on the Examiner's proposed combination of Adiwoso, Schiff and Hreha, claims 11-14 stand rejected based on the Examiner's proposed combination Adiwoso, Schiff and Setoyama, and claims 15 and 16 stand rejected based on the Examiner's proposed combination of Adiwoso, Schiff and Sharon.

As acknowledged by the Examiner, Adiwoso fails to disclose or suggest "common means of burst synchronization such that the transmission rate in a downlink direction from the satellite is a whole multiple of a clock reference of said network" as recited in independent claims 1 and 8. To overcome the admitted deficiency with respect to this claim limitation, the Examiner has proposed to combine Schiff with Adiwoso.

However, applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's combination of Schiff with Adiwoso still fails to disclose or suggest common means of burst synchronization such that the transmission rate in a downlink direction from the satellite is a whole multiple of a clock reference of said network, as recited in independent claims 1 and 8.

More specifically, Schiff discloses a downlink rate of 10 Mbit for a carrier at column 2, line 63. However, Schiff is silent as to the relationship between the network clock reference (NCR) and the transmission downlink rate. While the Examiner states that FIG. 5 of Schiff discloses that in a single frame with subframes 1…M, Schiff is silent as to the relationship

between the NCR and the transmission downlink rate in FIG. 5. While the Examiner asserts that

the I frame is characterized as the period of the downlink transmission, applicant respectfully

submits that Schiff itself does not disclose or suggest how the NCR and the downlink

transmission rate are related as whole multiples. For example, but not by way of limitation,

Schiff discloses a bandwidth of 72 MHz, and a transmission rate of 10 Mbit/second. Applicant

respectfully submits that the foregoing values are not whole multiples of each other.

Additionally, applicant respectfully submits that the proposed combinations of references

fail to teach or suggest the claimed combination of features in claims 1 and 5, including the

recitation that the period of the downlink frame is equal to the period of the uplink frame, *in*

combination with the recitation that the downlink transmission rate is a whole multiple of the

NCR, as required by claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Schiff does not disclose or even

suggest how the NCR relates to the uplink frame period and the downlink frame period.

Thus, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of the

claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

_/Mainak H. Mehta/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   Mainak H. Mehta
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Registration No. 46,924
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 4, 2007